# THE REED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP

800 MENLO AVENUE, SUITE 210 MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA 94025 (650) 330-0900 TELEPHONE (650) 330-0980 FACSIMILE WWW.REEDPATENT.COM

RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER** 

MAR 0 8 2005

## FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

To:

Mail Stop Amendment

**USPTO** 

Attn: Examiner Monique R. Jackson

**Group Art Unit 1773** 

FROM:

Mark L. Warzel

Reg. No. 47,264

FACSIMILE NO.: (650) 330-0980

TELEPHONE No.: (650) 330-0900

DATE:

March 8, 2005

PAGE 1 OF: 6

SUBJECT:

U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/774,340

Filed February 6, 2004

CONFIRMATION COPY TO FOLLOW:

FACSIMILE No.: (703) 872-9306

☐ YES 🖾 NO

For "PREPARATION OF IMAGES ON A SUBSTRATE SURFACE UTILIZING AN **OPAQUE COATING COMPOSITION** THAT BECOMES TRANSPARENT UPON

PRINTING"

By Asutosh Nigam

Atty Doc. No. 8500-0256.10

Please see the attached Response to Restriction Requirement and related transmittal documents for the above-identified patent application.

PTO/SB/21 (08-03) Approved for use through 08/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 10/774,340 TRANSMITTAL Filing Date February 6, 2004 FORM First Named Inventor Asutosh Nigam Art Unit 1773 (to be used for all correspondence after initial filling) Examiner Name Monique R. Jackson Mail Stop | Amendment Attorney Docket Number 8500-0256.10 ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply) 🔀 No fee due Drawing(s) After Allowance Communication Foe Transmittal Licensing-related Papers to a Technology Center (TC) Fee(s) due Petition Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Fee Transmittal Petition to Convert to a Check for \$\* Provisional Application Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Charge any underpayment or Power of Attorney, Revocation, **Proprietary Information** credit any overpayment to Change of Correspondence Address Deposit Account No. 18-0580 Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please Return postcard Terminal Disclaimer identify below): Response to Restriction Request for Refund Requirement CD, Number of CD(s): After Final Remarks: Affidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request Information Disclosure Statement & Form(s) PTO-1449 Copy(ies) of cited reference(s) Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Response to Missing Parts / Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm or Mark L. Warzel, Reg. No. 47,264 Reed Intellectual Property Law Group Telephone (650) 330-0900 Individual Name (print/type) Signature Date March 8, 2005 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner Monique R. Jackson in Group Art Unit 1773 of the USPTO at facsimile number (703) 872-9306 on the date shown below Name (print/type) Joe Clark Signature Date March 8, 2005

EEE TOANOMITTAL					0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			
FEE TRANSMITTAL		Application	Application Number 10/774,340					
for FY 2005  Ellucive 10/01/01. Pulum toos are subject to annual revision.		Filing Date						
				February 6, 2004				
					Asutosh Nigam Monique R. Jackson			
Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CER 1 27			Group Art Unit 1773			son		
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT \$0.00		<del>                                       </del>						
		Allomey Docket No. 8500-0256.10						
METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)								
The control of the coppy)	2 AT	FEE CALCULATION (continued) 3. ADDITIONAL FEES						
Check Credit card Money Order Other None		Large Entity   Small Entity						
Doposil Account:		c Fac Fas Foo Fee Description						
Deposit Account No. 18-0580		c (\$)	Code		ree Di	secupuon	Foe Paid	
Deposit Account Name   Rend IP   au Group		1 130	2051	65	Surcharge - late	filing fee or oath		
The Commissioner is authorized to: (check all that apply)		2 50	2052	25	Surchargo - late	provisional filing		
Charge any underpayment or credit any overpayments		3 130	1053	130	lea of cover she	et		
		2,520	1812	2,520	Non-English spe For filing a reque	onication		
Charge any additional foc(s) during the pendency of this application			i		reexamination		1	
Charge fee(s) Indicated below, except for the filing fee to the		920*	1804	920*	Requesting publ	ication of SIR prior	<del></del>	
above-identified deposit account.		1,840*	1805	1,840	lo Examiner octi	On San San		
		•	1,840* 1805 1,840* Requesting publication of S Examiner action		ication of Silk after	1		
FEE CALCULATION		120	2251	60	Extension for reg	aly within first		
d DAGO EU MO OTA		2 450	2252	225	month			
1. BASIC FILING, SEARCH AND EXAMINATION FEES		- 100	2232	225	Extension for rep	ly Willian second		
Large Entity   Small Entity		1,020	2253	510	Extension for rep	oly willin third		
For For For For For Description For Paid	1254	4 500	2051		מותסתו		1 1	
Code (\$) Code (\$)	1234	1,590	2254	795	Extension for rep	ily within fourth		
1001 790 2001 395 Utility filing fee (filed	1255	2,160	2255	1,080	month Extension for rep	du withla tera	<b>—</b>	
1011 300 2011 150 Utility filing fee (filed				1,000	month (01 102	ay waana tern	1	
ofter 12/8/04)	1401 1402		2401	250	Notice of Appeal			
1111 500 2111 250 Search Fee	1402	500	2402	250	Filling a brief in st	ns to hoggi		
1311 200 2311 100 Examination Fee	1403	1,000	2403	500	appoul Request for oral (	hnast	ļ	
500   120   701   6801) (1001  101  21   )	1451		1451	1,510	Polition to institut	nearing In a public use	<del> </del>	
50 sheels exceeding	1452	500			proceeding			
	1453		2452 2453	250 750	Pelilion to revive	- unavoidable		
SUBTOTAL (1) \$	1501		2501	700	Petition to revive — unintentional Utility issue fee (or reissue)			
	1502		2502	400	Design issue fee (or reliable)			
2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE	1503 1807		2503	550	Plant issue fee			
Extro Fee from Fee Paid		50	1807	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR			
Total Claims 62 -62" = 0 x below =		180		180	1.17(q) Submission of Information		ļ	
					Disclosure Stmt			
Independent 4 -4" = 0 x =	8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment		r	
Multiple Dopperdent					per property (time	s number of	'	
	1809	790	2809	395	properties) Filing a submission	o aller final	ļ	
Large Entity   Small Entity			_		rejection (37 CFR	\$ 1.129(a))	1 1.	
Foo Foo Foo Foo <u>Foo Description</u> Code (\$) Codo (\$)	1810	790	2810	395	For each addition:	al invention to be	<del></del>	
Code (\$) Codo (\$) 1202 50 2202 25 Claim in excess of 20	1801	790	2801	395	examined (37 CF)	R § 1.129(b)) nued Examination		
1201 200 2201 100 Independent claims in excess of 3			-501	<b>4</b>	(RCE)	nued Examination		
1203 300 2203 180 Multiple dependent claim, if not paid	1802	900	1802	900	Request for expec	lited examination	├	
1204 200 22.04 100 Reissus Independent claims over Original potent	1814	130	2514	05.00	ol a dusign applic:	alion		
1205 50 2205 25 "Roissue claims in excess of 20	Other	ice (specity)		65.00	Statutory Disclaim	er		
and over original patent		Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Poid						
			-		5561	O I VIC (3)	\$	
SUBTOTAL (2) 5								
"or number proviously paid, if greater, For Reissues, see above								
Y The min in animal 1 of Languages, 2000 SIDING								
SUBMITTED BY								
Namo (Print/Typo) Mark L. Warzer Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)   47,264   Telephone   (650) 330,0000								
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					Telephone	(650) 330-0900	7	
Signature					Date	Mascah G. AAS		
1 1 1/20/12 1 2 1	つし				Pare	March 8, 2005	ı	

Response dated March 8, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 8, 2005

Atty Dkt No. 8500-0256.10 SRI No. US 4033-3

### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

In re Application of:

Asutosh Nigam

Confirmation No. 5320

MAR 0 8 2005

Scrial No.: 10/774,340

Group Art Unit: 1773

Filing Date: February 6, 2004

Examiner: Monique R. JACKSON

Title: PREPARATION OF IMAGES ON A SUBSTRATE SURFACE UTILIZING AN OPAQUE COATING COMPOSITION THAT BECOMES TRANSPARENT UPON PRINTING

# RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR RESTRICTION AND ELECTION OF SPECIES

Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed February 8, 2005. In the Office Action, restriction between the following two groups of claims has been required:

- 1. Claims 1-40 and 47-55, drawn to a process for producing an image; and
- II. Claims 41-46 and 56-62, drawn to a coated substrate.

A species election has also been required from among the following claimed opaque coating compositions:

- 1. The combination of a monomeric polyacid and a monomeric polybase;
- 2. The combination of a monomeric polyacid and a polymeric polybase; and
- The combination of a polymeric polyacid and a monomeric polybase.

A further election of particular species compounds has also been required for each of the monomeric polyacid, polymeric polyacid, monomeric polybase, and polymeric polybase.

#### Response to Restriction Requirement:

Applicant elects Group I, claims 1-40 and 47-55, with traverse.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Restriction Requirement since the reasons cited in the Office Action do not support the statement that the "product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process" (emphasis added). In fact, no actual reference to such a hypothetically "materially different process" is even cited in the Office Action. Instead, only a reference to the product not requiring a recording liquid is mentioned.

Appl. Ser. No. 10/774,340 Response dated March 8, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 8, 2005

Applicant also respectfully submits that the reasoning provided in the Office Action is not pertinent to establishing support for the Restriction Requirement. In particular, as claimed, the coated substrate "becomes partially or entirely transparent upon contact with a recording liquid," while the claimed process comprises "contacting the coated substrate with a recording liquid that renders the opaque coating partially or entirely transparent". Since both the process and the product refer to the same characteristic provided to the coated substrate (i.e., the same substrate coated with the same claimed opaque coating composition), no apparent distinction exists to warrant separating the claimed product from the process that produces such a product. In short, within the context of the language utilized in the claims, there is no "materially different process" that could be utilized to produce the product having the claimed characteristic. At the very least, no such process has been mentioned in the Office Action to support the grounds relied upon for Restriction.

For at least the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is requested.

## Response to Election of Species Requirement:

Applicant elects the species wherein the opaque coating composition comprises a monomeric polyacid and a monomeric polybase.

Applicant further elects the species wherein the monomeric polyacid is a carboxylic acid containing compound. For the purposes of conducting the initial search and examination only, applicant selects the dicarboxylic acid compound maleic acid.

Applicant further elects the species wherein the monomeric polybase is an amine containing compound. For the purposes of conducting the initial search and examination only, applicant selects the diamine compound ethylenediamine.

It is assumed that an election of the polymeric polyacid and polymeric polybase is not required in light of the above election of the monomeric species noted above. However, should the Examiner require such an election, applicant selects poly(acrylic acid) as the polymeric polyacid and polyethylencimine as the polymeric polybase.

Within Group I, claims 1-40 and 47-55 are generic to an opaque coating composition that comprises the elected monomeric polyacid and the monomeric polybase. In addition, claims 1-9, 21-40, and 47-55 are believed to read on the elected process in which the claimed opaque coating composition includes a monomeric polyacid and a monomeric polybase, without positively reciting the presence of a polymeric polyacid and/or polymeric polybase (although these components may generally also be present within the scope of the claims).

Applicant notes this election of species and ultimate species is for the sole purpose of the carrying

Appl. Scr. No. 10/774,340 Response dated March 8, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 8, 2005

out the initial search and examination of the claims, and that upon allowance of a generic claim, applicant is entitled to have all non-elected species encompassed by that claim examined (37 C.F.R. 1.141).

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, or wish to discuss the application as the search and examination are initiated, a telephone call to the undersigned at (650) 330-0900 would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

By

Mark L. Warze

Registration No. 47,264

REED IP LAW GROUP 800 Menlo Avenue, Suite 210 Menlo Park, California 94025 (650) 330-0900 Telephone (650) 330-0980 Facsimile

F:\Document\8500\0256\10\Response to Restriction.doc